



ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

Digital Transcripts • Internet Realtime • HD Legal Video • Picture-in-Picture Depositions
Remote Depositions • Designation Editing • Nationwide Scheduling • HD Videoconferencing

Transcript of Proceedings

October 18, 2023

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council v.

Thank you for choosing BA Litigation Services for your court reporting, legal video, and deposition technology needs. It is always our goal to provide you with exceptional service. If there is anything we can do to assist you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR
Vice President



The Premier Advantage™
PDF transcript bundle contains:

- Full-size and condensed transcripts
- Printable word index
- Hyperlinked selectable word index
- Embedded printable exhibit scans
- Hyperlinked selectable exhibit viewing
- Common file formats: txt, lrf, mdb
accessed via *paperclip* icon

WASHINGTON STATE

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

MONTHLY MEETING

October 18, 2023

Lacey, Washington

Reporter: John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR

1 APPEARANCES

2 STATE AGENCY MEMBERS:

3 Kathleen Drew, Chair (*)

4 Eli Levitt, Department of Ecology (*)

5 Mike Livingston, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

6 Lenny Young, Department of Natural Resources

7 Stacey Brewster,
8 Utilities & Transportation Commission (*)

9 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND OPTIONAL STATE AGENCIES:

10 Horse Heaven:

11 Derek Sandison, Department of Agriculture

12 Ed Brost, Benton County

13 Wautoma Solar:

14 Dave Sharp, Benton County

15 Hop Hill Solar:

16 Paul Krupin, Benton County

17 Carriger Solar:

18 Matt Chiles, Klickitat County

19 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL:

20 Jon Thompson (*)

21 Jenna Slocum

22 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

23 Adam Torem
24
25

1 APPEARANCES (Continuing)

2 COUNCIL STAFF:

3 Sonia Bumpus (*) Lance Caputo (*)
4 Ami Hafkemeyer (*) John Barnes
5 Joan Owens (*) Osta Davis
6 Andrea Grantham (*) Joanne Snarski
7 Dave Walker Alex Shiley
8 Sonja Skavland Ali Smith
9 Lisa Masengale Karl Holappa
10 Sean Greene
11

12 OPERATIONAL UPDATES:

13 Eric Melbardis
14 Kittitas Valley Wind, EDP Renewables
15 Jennifer Galbraith
16 Wild Horse Wind Power Project, Puget Sound Energy
17 Chris Sherin
18 Grays Harbor Energy Center, Grays Harbor Energy
19 Jeremy Smith
20 Chehalis Generation Facility, PacifiCorp
21 Felicia Najera-Paxton
22 Columbia Generating Station & WNP-1/4, Energy
23 Northwest
24 Thomas Cushing
25 Columbia Solar, Tuusso Energy
Scott Wilson
Goose Prairie Solar, Brookfield Renewable

APPEARANCES (Continuing)

(*) indicates that the participant is attending in person in Lacey, Washington. (All other participants are attending remotely.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MEETING INDEX	
EVENT:	PAGE NO.
Call to order	6
Roll call	6
Proposed agenda	11
Minutes	
9/20/2023 Monthly Meeting	11
Projects	
Kittitas Valley Wind Project	12
Wild Horse Wind Power Project	13
Grays Harbor Energy Center	13
Chehalis Generation Facility	13
Columbia Solar	14
Columbia Generating Station, WNP-1/4	14
Goose Prairie Solar	15
High Top and Ostrea	16
Whistling Ridge	16
Desert Claim	17
Horse Heaven Wind Farm	25
Badger Mountain	52
Wautoma Solar	53
Hop Hill Solar	55
Carriger Solar	56
2nd Quarter Cost Allocation	58
Adjournment	59

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Wednesday,
2 October 18, 2023, at 621 Woodland Square Loop
3 Southeast, Lacey, Washington, at 1:30 p.m., the
4 following Monthly Meeting of the Washington State
5 Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was held, to
6 wit:

7 <<<<<< >>>>>>

8
9 CHAIR DREW: Good afternoon. This
10 is Kathleen Drew, Chair of the Energy Facility Site
11 Evaluation Council, calling this meeting to order.

12 Ms. Grantham, will you call the roll.

13 MS. GRANTHAM: Certainly.
14 Department of Commerce.

15 Department of Ecology.

16 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt, present.

17 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of Fish
18 and Wildlife.

19 MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston,
20 present.

21 MS. GRANTHAM: Department of
22 Natural Resources.

23 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young, present.

24 MS. GRANTHAM: Utilities &
25 Transportation Commission.

1 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster,
2 present.

3 MS. GRANTHAM: Local government and
4 optional State agencies: For the Horse Heaven project,
5 Department of Agriculture.

6 MR. SANDISON: Derek Sandison,
7 present.

8 MS. GRANTHAM: Benton County, Ed
9 Brost.

10 I do see Mr. Brost is present.

11 For the Badger Mountain project: For Douglas
12 County, Jordyn Guilio.

13 For the Wautoma Solar Project: For Benton County,
14 Dave Sharp.

15 MR. SHARP: Dave Sharp, present.

16 MS. GRANTHAM: Washington State
17 Department of Transportation, Paul Gonseth.

18 For the Hop Hill Solar Project: For Benton
19 County, Paul Krupin.

20 MR. KRUPIN: Paul Krupin, present.

21 MS. GRANTHAM: For Carriger Solar:
22 Klickitat County, Matt Chiles.

23 MR. CHILES: Matt Chiles, present.

24 MS. GRANTHAM: Assistant attorney
25 generals: Jon Thompson.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Jon Thompson,
2 present.

3 MS. GRANTHAM: Jenna Slocum.

4 MS. SLOCUM: Jenna Slocum, present.

5 MS. GRANTHAM: And I do remember we
6 do have a new assistant attorney general. Jon
7 Thompson, can you please remind me of his name? I
8 missed his name on the roll call sheet.

9 MR. THOMPSON: It is Zack Packer.

10 MS. GRANTHAM: And is Zack present?

11 Administrative law judges: Adam Torem.

12 JUDGE TOREM: This is Judge Torem.

13 I'm present.

14 MS. GRANTHAM: Laura Bradley.

15 Dan Gerard.

16 Joni Derifield.

17 For Council staff: Sonia Bumpus.

18 MS. BUMPUS: Sonia Bumpus, present.

19 MS. GRANTHAM: Ami Hafkemeyer.

20 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Ami Hafkemeyer,
21 present.

22 MS. GRANTHAM: Amy Moon.

23 Stew Henderson.

24 Joan Owens is present.

25 Dave Walker.

1 Sonja Skavland.

2 MS. SKAVLAND: Sonja Skavland,
3 present.

4 MS. GRANTHAM: Lisa Masengale.

5 MS. MASENGALE: Present.

6 MS. GRANTHAM: Sara Randolph.

7 Sean Greene.

8 MS. REYNEVELD: Sarah Reyneveld,
9 present.

10 MS. GRANTHAM: Was that
11 Ms. Reyneveld?

12 MS. REYNEVELD: That's correct.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. GRANTHAM: Okay. Thank you.
15 You said "present" a little early, but I'll mark you
16 down for counsel for the environment.

17 Sean Greene for Council staff.

18 MR. GREENE: Sean Greene, present.

19 MS. GRANTHAM: Lance Caputo.

20 MR. CAPUTO: Lance Caputo, present.

21 MS. GRANTHAM: John Barnes.

22 MR. BARNES: Present.

23 MS. GRANTHAM: Osta Davis.

24 MS. DAVIS: Present.

25 MS. GRANTHAM: Joanne Snarski.

1 MS. SNARSKI: Joanne Snarski,
2 present.
3 MS. GRANTHAM: Alex Shiley.
4 Ali Smith.
5 MS. SMITH: Ali Smith, present.
6 MS. GRANTHAM: Karl Holappa.
7 MR. HOLAPPA: Holappa, present.
8 MS. GRANTHAM: And for operational
9 updates: Kittitas Valley wind project.
10 MR. MELBARDIS: Eric Melbardis,
11 present.
12 MS. GRANTHAM: Wild Horse wind power
13 project.
14 MS. GALBRAITH: Jennifer Galbraith,
15 present.
16 MS. GRANTHAM: Grays Harbor Energy
17 Center.
18 MR. SHERIN: Bruce Sherin, present.
19 MS. GRANTHAM: Chehalis Generation
20 Facility.
21 MR. SMITH: Jeremy Smith, present.
22 MS. GRANTHAM: Columbia Generating
23 Station.
24 Columbia Solar.
25 MR. CUSHING: Thomas Cushing,

1 present.

2 MS. GRANTHAM: Goose Prairie Solar.

3 MR. WILSON: Scott Wilson, present.

4 MS. GRANTHAM: Chair, there is a
5 quorum for the regular Council and all of the other
6 councils. Thank you.

7 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

8 Now taking up the proposed agenda in front of you.

9 Council members, there's an echo. I think we're
10 okay now.

11 So the proposed agenda is in front of you.

12 Is there a motion to adopt the proposed agenda?

13 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. So moved.

14 MR. LEVITT: Eli Levitt. Second.

15 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

16 All those in favor, say "aye."

17 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

18 CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

19 Motion is adopted.

20 Moving on to the meeting minutes from September
21 20th, 2023.

22 Is there a motion to approve the meeting minutes?

23 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster.

24 Motion to approve the September 20th, 2023, meeting
25 minutes.

1 CHAIR DREW: Second?

2 MR. LIVINGSTON: Mike Livingston.

3 Second.

4 CHAIR DREW: Thanks.

5 I have no corrections.

6 Does anyone else have any edits or corrections?

7 Hearing none.

8 All those in favor of approving the minutes,

9 please say "aye."

10 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

11 CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

12 Motion is adopted.

13 Moving on to our operational updates.

14 Kittitas Valley wind project. Mr. Melbardis.

15 MS. GRANTHAM: Mr. Melbardis, you
16 are muted, if you're trying to speak. Just a heads-up.
17 I see that you're still in here, so hopefully.

18 MR. MELBARDIS: Sorry about that.

19 New -- new headset.

20 MS. GRANTHAM: No worries.

21 MR. MELBARDIS: This is Eric Mel- --

22 Eric Melbardis with EDP Renewables for the Kittitas
23 Valley wind power project.

24 And we had nothing nonroutine to report for the
25 period.

1 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

2 Moving on to the Wild Horse wind power project.
3 Ms. Galbraith.

4 MS. GALBRAITH: Yes. Thank you,
5 Chair Drew, Council members, and staff. This is
6 Jennifer Galbraith representing Puget Sound Energy for
7 the Wild Horse wind facility.

8 For the month of September, I have no nonroutine
9 updates.

10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

11 For Grays Harbor Energy Center, Mr. Sherin.

12 MR. SHERIN: Good afternoon, Chair
13 Drew, Council members, and staff. This is Chris
14 Sherin, a plant manager from Grays Harbor Energy
15 Center.

16 For the month of September, we have no nonroutine
17 items to report.

18 We did submit our RATA results to EFSEC staff and
19 ORCAA.

20 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

21 And apparently I took you out of order, so I will
22 go back to Chehalis Generation Facility, Mr. Smith.

23 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Chair
24 Drew, EFSEC Council, and staff. This is Jeremy Smith,
25 maintenance manager, representing Chehalis Generation

1 Facility.

2 I have one nonroutine item to report, and it's
3 Stefano Schnitger has assumed the plant manager
4 position effective September 6th.

5 Are there any questions?

6 CHAIR DREW: Great.

7 No. Thank you. Thank you for that update.

8 And moving on to the Columbia Solar project.

9 Mr. Cushing.

10 MR. CUSHING: Good -- hold on one
11 second. There's background noise.

12 Good afternoon, Chair Drew, Council members, and
13 staff. This is Thomas Cushing, asset manager for the
14 Columbia Solar projects.

15 For the month of September, we have no nonroutine
16 updates.

17 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

18 For the Columbia Generating Station and WNP-1
19 and -4, Felicia Najera-Paxton.

20 MS. NAJERA-PAXTON: Hi: Good
21 afternoon, Chairman Drew. Thanks for letting me join
22 kind of late. I apologize for that.

23 For this month, Columbia Generating Station has no
24 nonroutine items to report.

25 We did have a Washington State fire marshal

1 conduct inspection of the IDC and CGS buildings on
2 October 2nd through the 4th with no major findings
3 communicated following the inspection.

4 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

5 MS. NAJERA-PAXTON: Thank you.

6 CHAIR DREW: For Goose Prairie
7 Solar, Mr. Wilson.

8 MR. WILSON: Yeah, there is no
9 nonroutine updates to report.

10 As far as construction report, our project is on
11 schedule. All our -- excuse me. All our laydown yards
12 have been completed. The substation grading and
13 foundations are complete. Control house was delivered
14 and set at the site.

15 We just did get one of our main power transformers
16 today and got that set. The second one is scheduled to
17 come early November.

18 All our roads are in, interior and exterior roads.
19 The PV array mainline roads, like I said, are complete.
20 The feeders are complete. PV panels are starting to
21 arrive. We've got some panels starting to show up
22 tomorrow.

23 As far as SWPPP, it's being modified. We're going
24 to try to submit it to EFSEC within the next few weeks.

25 We do have monitoring through WSP. They're here

1 weekly. They have found nothing really to report.

2 As far as public outreach, we are -- that's -- us
3 and PCL are -- are getting together. We're going to
4 donate some AEDs to the Moxee Police Department. It's
5 going to be -- November 1st, we're going to have a
6 little -- little get-together with them and present the
7 AEDs.

8 And that is just a quick down-and-dirty for Goose
9 Prairie.

10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you. Thank you
11 very much.

12 Moving on to the High Top and Ostrea project.
13 Ms. Hafkemeyer.

14 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you. Good
15 afternoon, Chair Drew and Council.

16 For the High Top and Ostrea project, staff
17 continue to work with the developer on pre-
18 construction requirements and plans.

19 We have no other updates at this time.

20 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

21 For Whistling Ridge, Mr. Caputo, project update.

22 MR. CAPUTO: Thank you, Chair Drew
23 and Council members.

24 The applicants for the Whistling Ridge energy
25 project submitted an extension request as well as a

1 petition to amend their site certification agreement.
2 Staff are looking at available dates to schedule the
3 meetings for the Council.

4 May I answer any questions?

5 CHAIR DREW: Are there any
6 questions?

7 Thank you for the update.

8 Desert Claim. Ms. Hafkemeyer.

9 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you.

10 Again, for the record, this is Ami Hafkemeyer
11 providing a project update on Desert Claim.

12 At the last Council meeting on September 20th,
13 staff updated the Council on the proposed amendment to
14 the Desert Claim site certification agreement, or SCA,
15 in which the certificate holder, EDF Renewables,
16 submitted a request to amend the Desert Claim SCA. EDF
17 Renewables requested an extension of the substantial
18 completion date from November 13th, 2023, to November
19 13th, 2028.

20 As presented last month, the State Environmental
21 Policy Act, or SEPA, review was limited to the changes
22 proposed by the amendment request. Staff recommended
23 provisions for inclusion in the SCA amendment to
24 account for current conditions in the project area,
25 industry, or agency practices that have evolved since

1 the initial certification and information that has
2 become available since the Desert Claim SCA was last
3 amended in 2018.

4 At the previous meeting, I outlined the conditions
5 that staff recommended to include in an SCA amendment,
6 including:

7 limiting the build window by capping any further
8 SCA extension requests. Any further extension requests
9 would not be allowed unless construction is reasonably
10 underway but may not reach the definition of
11 substantial completion;

12 including a requirement for the aircraft detection
13 lighting system, if approved by the Federal Aviation
14 Administration, to be reviewed for any appropriate
15 additional permit requirements;

16 including a commitment in the Desert Claim waste
17 management plan to recycle project components when
18 possible;

19 and requiring the certificate holder to consider
20 the feasibility during micro-siting to place all
21 turbines more than .5 miles from nonparticipating
22 residences to avoid dominating views from these
23 sensitive viewing locations.

24 One additional recommendation was made during the
25 September 20th Council meeting associated with

1 extending the wildlife monitoring for carcasses.
2 However, after additional evaluation by EFSEC staff,
3 this was determined to already be included in the SCA.
4 Therefore, this recommendation has not been
5 incorporated into the resolution that you have in front
6 of you for consideration.

7 At the September 20th Council meeting, Council
8 directed staff to discuss these recommendations with
9 the developer and prepare a resolution for Council
10 consideration. Staff met with EDF Renewables to
11 confirm concurrence on these provisions. The draft was
12 provided to Council review and made available for
13 public comment.

14 Staff received one public comment speaking against
15 the viability of the project, but that did not result
16 in any suggested changes to the draft resolution.

17 If the Council approves the resolution as drafted,
18 staff will prepare an amended SCA to reflect these
19 changes for review and approval at the November Council
20 meeting.

21 At this time, staff recommend Council deliberate
22 and a vote to approve the draft resolution.

23 Are there any questions?

24 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions
25 for Ms. Hafkemeyer?

1 Okay. You-all have and have received the draft
2 resolution in front of you.

3 Is there a motion to approve the draft resolution
4 as presented, approving the request for amendment for
5 Desert Claim wind power project?

6 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. I move the
7 resolution as amended.

8 MR. LEVITT: May I ask a few
9 questions?

10 CHAIR DREW: Oh. Sure. Absolutely.

11 MR. LEVITT: I'm sorry. One is just
12 a details nuance. You said half a mile from any
13 residence, but the letter says 2,500 feet, so that's a
14 little bit different.

15 MR. YOUNG: Chair, point of order.
16 Do we need to have the resolution -- the dra- -- the
17 matter that's in front of us seconded before we begin
18 discussion?

19 CHAIR DREW: Sure. We can have a
20 second.

21 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster.
22 Second.

23 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

24 Okay. Please continue, Mr. Levitt.

25 Ms. Hafkemeyer.

1 MS. HAFKEMEYER: So the proposed
2 resolution -- I'm sorry. I'm not seeing the 2500 feet.

3 I believe the 2500 feet was part of the amendment
4 in 2018, and staff are proposing that it be increased
5 to half a mile, which is a little bit more than 2500
6 feet. I think it's approximately 26- or 2700 feet.

7 MR. LEVITT: Yeah.

8 MS. HAFKEMEYER: The feasibility of
9 that be reviewed. If -- if there's a typo with the
10 draft resolution, certainly we can amend that.

11 MR. LEVITT: 2500 is listed on
12 Page 1, so maybe --

13 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Page 1.

14 MR. LEVITT: -- it is talking about
15 the old agreement.

16 Bottom of Page 1.

17 CHAIR DREW: Yes. Yes, that would
18 be the background there. And so the resolution, then,
19 if you look to -- well, the -- yes, it's all the
20 resolution, but let's double-check.

21 MR. LEVITT: And then while we're
22 checking that, I have a question about the -- the --
23 one public comment seemed to indicate that the
24 population in that area has changed. Maybe new
25 housing, new residents.

1 To what degree has the applicant and/or EFSEC been
2 able to reach out to people about the ongoing history
3 of this project?

4 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Staff have not
5 conducted outreach outside of noticing for these
6 activities. I would have to check with the applicant
7 about any additional activities.

8 One of the topics of discussion amongst staff and
9 the developer was that, in the 2018 amendment, the
10 primary visual concern was shadow flicker, and so that
11 was the -- the consideration for the setback for the
12 2018 amendment. And so the -- the recommendation to
13 include -- or to increase that to half a mile would be
14 for not only shadow flicker but visual dominance. And
15 so at least internally, that discussion has evolved
16 somewhat, but we have not had direct input from nearby
17 residents.

18 We also noticed the existing distribution list
19 with updated contacts, so anybody who was previously
20 following the Desert Claim project should still have
21 received notice for this activity.

22 CHAIR DREW: As well as people
23 within a certain geographic distance from the project.

24 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Yeah. The -- the
25 original list would have included the one-mile

1 landowners.

2 CHAIR DREW: One-mile landowners.

3 Okay.

4 Other questions?

5 MR. LEVITT: That's it.

6 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

7 Are there --

8 MR. YOUNG: Chair. Chair.

9 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

10 MR. YOUNG: Chair, this -- Chair,
11 this is Lenny Young. Could staff --

12 CHAIR DREW: Yes.

13 MR. YOUNG: -- refresh as to the
14 need for a five-year extension as opposed to a one- or
15 two-year extension? What information is available to
16 the Council as to the length of the extension?

17 MS. HAFKEMEYER: It's staff's
18 understanding that a five-year extension would allow
19 the developer to enter into offtake agreements and
20 power -- I think, power purchase agreements as well as
21 to begin construction.

22 So this extension would also include the
23 initiation of construction, not just the power purchase
24 agreements and offtake agreements.

25 MR. YOUNG: Is it staff's assessment

1 that that's a reasonable request, a reasonable amount
2 of time?

3 MS. HAFKEMEYER: It is. We are
4 aware that they are actively participating in request
5 for proposals to find buyers for this project, and it
6 is our understanding that those are sort of an ongoing
7 process and that there are multiple RFPs and
8 opportunities coming up in the -- the coming years.

9 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

10 CHAIR DREW: Any other questions?
11 Ms. Brewster?

12 MS. BREWSTER: Yeah.

13 Regarding the feasibility study of placing the
14 turbines outside of a half mile, what's the case if
15 they present that that is not feasible? Is there any
16 requirements for distance that we can impose?

17 MS. HAFKEMEYER: I think that we
18 could impose the requirement for half a mile in --
19 'cause at this point, it's -- it's a flexibility of, I
20 think, approximately 200 feet. When we met with E --
21 EDF Renewables, they did request to maintain some of
22 that flexibility for engineering purposes.

23 CHAIR DREW: Also I believe that if
24 it is less than that, the certificate holder would
25 submit for the Council's review, prior to micro-siting,

1 an analysis of the feasibility. So we would have that
2 come to us before the final decision, as -- as is
3 written in this resolution.

4 MS. BREWSTER: Thank you.

5 CHAIR DREW: Other questions?

6 Hearing none.

7 There's a motion on the floor to approve the draft
8 resolution as presented, approving the request for
9 amendment for Desert Claim.

10 All those in favor, please say "aye."

11 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

12 CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

13 The resolution is adopted. Thank you.

14 Okay. Moving on to the Horse Heaven project,
15 project update. Ms. Hafkemeyer.

16 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Thank you, Chair
17 Drew.

18 EFSEC have received the post-adjudication
19 application for site certification from the applicant
20 on September 22nd, 2023. This updated ASC included a
21 traffic impact analysis, updated surveys and reports,
22 turbine and solar reductions, and updated commitments.

23 The reduction in proposed turbines is to remove 13
24 turbines from Turbine Option 1, for a total of 231
25 turbines, and three turbines from Turbine Option 2, for

1 a total of 147 turbines.

2 The solar reduction is to reduce energy generation
3 at the eastern solar array from 300 megawatts to 100
4 megawatts and a reduction in solar array footprint from
5 6,570 acres to 5,447 acres.

6 Staff have been very busy incorporating the
7 updated post-adjudication ASC, which was required
8 within 30 days after the conclusion of the hearings per
9 Washington Administrative Code 463-60-116.

10 EFSEC is currently updating the analysis of
11 impacts for the final environmental impact statement,
12 or final EIS, and incorporating the traffic impact
13 analysis that was received with the post-adjudication
14 ASC update.

15 Final EIS tasks also include incorporating public
16 comments, agency outreach, tribal coordination, and
17 fine-tuning mitigation.

18 Before I continue, are there any questions?

19 CHAIR DREW: Any questions from
20 Council members?

21 MS. HAFKEMEYER: All right. This
22 afternoon, we have Sean Greene available, who will be
23 giving a presentation on the final EIS so that Council
24 are familiar with the structure and changes as you
25 approach your upcoming review. Staff are anticipating

1 that the final EIS will be issued and available to the
2 Council and the public October 31st of this year.

3 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

4 Mr. Greene.

5 MR. GREENE: Yes. Just watching my
6 presentation spin for a minute here.

7 Thank you, Chair Drew and Council. My -- my name
8 is Sean Greene. I am the SEPA specialist and
9 environmental planner for EFSEC.

10 And as Ami mentioned, the purpose of this
11 presentation is to update the Council on changes taken
12 to the Horse Heaven EIS since the publication of the
13 draft EIS and brief the Council on what changes that
14 they should look for in their review of the upcoming
15 final EIS that will be published -- that the target
16 publication date is the end of the month.

17 If you can go to the next slide.

18 So upon publication of the draft EIS, we entered
19 into a public comment period. As required by
20 Washington Administrative Code, the period was 30 days
21 in length plus a additional 15-day extension period per
22 request, so 45 days total.

23 Upon the culmination of that period, that comment
24 period, we had public hearings on February 1st of 2023,
25 during which we had 74 speakers. In combination

1 between written and verbal comments, we had
2 approximately 2500 comments received. 1,217 of those
3 were deemed substantive, and that -- in this case, non-
4 substantive comments were those that generally
5 expressed support or opposition for the project without
6 specifically suggesting changes or questions, or
7 comments that were otherwise irrelevant to the
8 environmental review of the project.

9 All comment responses, substantive or not, will
10 receive a response as part of this process. And
11 revisions are integrated throughout the -- the final
12 EIS from those comment responses.

13 Next slide, please.

14 Since the publication of the draft EIS, we've had
15 a series of discussions with other agencies and
16 governments in the process of developing the final EIS,
17 the most prominent of which was the Yakama Nation, who
18 we had begun monthly meetings with between Yakama
19 Nation staff and EFSEC staff, following the expressed
20 desire for more regular discussion between our staffs
21 from Chairman Lewis of the Yakama Nation.

22 As part of those discussions, the Yakama Nation
23 have shared confidential wildlife and cultural data
24 that has been incorporated into the FEIS. All
25 references within the publicly available FEIS have been

1 either referenced indirectly or redacted so as to
2 protect the confidentiality of the data. But the
3 unredacted versions will be included with the FEIS
4 under separate cover for the Council during the review.

5 We also had a series of discussions with
6 Washington State Department of Transportation during
7 our coordination on the development of the traffic
8 impact analysis and the review of the subsequently
9 published analysis that the applicant provided.

10 Next slide, please.

11 There were a series of data collections taken
12 since the draft EIS that had been incorporated into the
13 FEIS, the first of which was the traffic impact
14 analysis, which included project-generated trips,
15 peak-hour traffic volumes, oversized truck haul routes,
16 and traffic safety analyses.

17 These were developed based on conversations with
18 the County and Washington State Department of
19 Transportation, and the process of incorporating
20 that -- the data collected into the impact assessments
21 within the transportation section of the FEIS is
22 ongoing.

23 Also, there were updated raptor nest surveys that
24 were performed following the 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2022
25 surveys that were intended to track the status of

1 previously identified nests and identify new nests
2 within the area.

3 And the third primary new source of data was the
4 inclusion of three new key -- key observation points
5 that came about as a result of public comments received
6 following the draft EIS. These -- and new visual
7 simulations were created for these key -- these KOPs,
8 these key observation points, and existing simulations
9 were updated to re- -- to reduce the effect of hazing
10 from atmospheric conditions that were -- that that
11 hazing was included in the original versions of those
12 simulations.

13 These new KOPs were intended to address impacts to
14 motorists, residents, and cultural resources, depending
15 on the individual KOP.

16 Next slide, please.

17 So these next two slides are referencing project
18 reductions that came about due to applicant commitments
19 following the adjudication process. This slide
20 specifically is in reference to the Data Request 9
21 response, which was, I think, more -- more commonly
22 referred to as the Moon memo during the adjudication
23 process for Council reference.

24 **A summary of the changes:**

25 **That the reductions specifically were reducing the**

1 east solar array from approximately 2,000 acres to just
2 over 600 acres, for about a 1400-acre reduction.

3 Shifting three turbines from Turbine Option 1 away
4 from Webber and Sheep Canyons.

5 Removing 13 proposed turbines from Turbine Option 1
6 and three from Turbine Option 2.

7 Removing duplicate transmission lines and
8 substation infrastructure, which included the appro- --
9 the conversion of approximately four miles of
10 transmission lines to buried collector lines. While
11 that -- and that is a case where it is both a reduction
12 and addition because it is reducing visual impacts, but
13 there is an associated increase in temporary
14 disturbance, which is being incorporated into the FEIS
15 review.

16 And, finally, a reduction of the east battery
17 station to 100 megawatts from 150. There is no
18 associated reduction in footprint associated with this,
19 however.

20 Next slide, please. Thank you.

21 These -- this slide covers reductions that were
22 proposed by the applicant following that Data Request 9
23 response in Sep- -- this was a specific memo on
24 September 26th. It included a -- an additional nine
25 proposed turbines to be removed from Turbine Option 1,

1 accounting for 22 total between the two reductions.
2 And this -- this specific memo, this nine-turbine
3 reduction, is referenced within the FEIS, but it is not
4 included in our impact analysis due to time
5 constraints, but it will be available to the Council
6 for their consideration when reading through the FEIS
7 and, assuming the project is approved, incorporation
8 into these -- the site certification agreement.

9 And the applicant noted that the turbines that
10 were re- -- proposed for removal between Turbine
11 Options 1 and 2 were due to concerns noted in public
12 comments and adjudication and were intended to reduce
13 impacts to several different resources.

14 And as an example, that visual at the bottom of
15 this page is a sim- -- a visual simulation provided by
16 the applicant from a key observation point. And the
17 three closest turbines within that green rectangle are
18 three of the 22 that are proposed for removal from the
19 final project design.

20 Next slide, please.

21 And in -- in concert with the reductions that the
22 applicant has proposed, since the draft EIS, they have
23 proposed a number of additions to the project. This --
24 all additions were included within that Data Request 9
25 response in August. The first is the addition of an

1 off-site laydown yard north of the project. That
2 covers approximately 23 acres. That is outside of the
3 previously surveyed area. This laydown yard would be
4 specifically used for temporary laydown of turbine
5 blades before installation. And staff is currently
6 developing additional mitigation and the necessary data
7 collection for potential use of this laydown yard.

8 In addition, there was the passage of House
9 Bill 1173, which requires all current and future wind
10 turbine projects within the state of Washington to
11 request FAA approval for the use of an aircraft
12 detection lighting system. The applicant has gone
13 through the planning process for how to incorporate
14 this into the project and has come to the -- the point
15 where they believe five radar sensor towers, an example
16 of which can be seen in the bottom right of this page,
17 will be needed to be installed across the project
18 for -- for the implementation of the system.

19 One of these five towers is outside of the
20 previously surveyed area. And altogether, they will
21 require approximately 8,000 feet of new roads and
22 10,000 feet of new electrical infrastructure.

23 Next slide, please.

24 And the final project additions that were
25 incorporated into that Data Request 9 response were

1 the -- the upgrading and extension of the County Well
2 Road transmission line. Approximately four miles will
3 be upgraded from 230 kilovolts to 500 kilovolts, and
4 just over 1,000 feet of that new line and one new
5 support structure will be located outside of the
6 previously surveyed area.

7 And that visual on the bottom right, the -- the
8 top image is the existing conditions at that key
9 observation point. The bottom is the original visual
10 simulation. The towers in the blue rectangle, as part
11 of this upgrade, will be more akin in size to the
12 existing towers in the yellow rectangle, so they will
13 be taller.

14 And the final addition was that the west battery
15 station will be upgraded from 150 megawatts to 200
16 megawatts, which will increase the footprint of that
17 from six acres to ten acres.

18 Next slide, please.

19 This image and a similar one for Turbine Option 2
20 will be provided to the Council with the FEIS. This is
21 a visual representation of the reductions, or rather,
22 the project changes that the -- the applicant has
23 proposed.

24 And just a few areas to note. The green
25 highlighted area in the bottom right is indicative of

1 the reduction. That's that east solar field.

2 The -- the green dots along the northern edge of
3 the project are the turbines that are proposed for
4 removal. They are primarily associated with the
5 ridgeline.

6 And the green lines on the western part are the
7 transmission lines that have been propo- -- that are no
8 longer proposed as part of the project, whereas the
9 blue one -- blue line is the newly proposed
10 transmission line.

11 And next slide, please.

12 As for the structure of the FEIS, it is similar to
13 the draft EIS, with the executive summary coming first,
14 Chapter 1 indicating project background, which includes
15 a SEPA review history and defines the purpose of need,
16 both for the project for the applicant and the EIS for
17 EFSEC.

18 Chapter 2, which will cover the proposed action
19 alternatives, which encompasses the project description
20 and alternatives that were assessed as part of the EIS,
21 including the no-action alternative.

22 Chapter 3 is the affected environment, which
23 covers pre-project conditions for the 14 SEPA
24 environmental resources and socioeconomics and also
25 represents the -- the no- -- the anticipated results of

1 the no- -- no-action alternative.

2 Chapter 4 is impacts and mitigation measures,
3 direct and indirect, from project actions. Applicant-
4 proposed avoidance and impact reduction commitments are
5 included in this section as well as EFSEC staff-
6 recommended mitigation. And this section also includes
7 the impact ratings for all -- all 15 resources that
8 were assessed.

9 Cumulative impacts. Chapter 5 will cover impacts
10 combined -- from the project alone, combined with other
11 past, present, or reasonably foreseeable developments.

12 And Chapter 10, which is new for this final EIS,
13 is the summary of public comments received and
14 responses on the draft EIS and will include
15 consolidated responses to public comments received.

16 Next slide, please.

17 And I won't go through all of these, but this is a
18 representative example of some of the changes that are
19 in Chapter 3 of the final EIS as a result of public
20 comments and are different from the draft EIS.

21 A few to note, however, are that we have included
22 viticultural areas and the wine industry as an affected
23 resource under land use due to public comments. And as
24 we noted before, in "Visual," the addition of three key
25 observation points with accompanying visual

1 simulations. These were intended to address previously
2 underrepresented or unrepresented viewshed concerns
3 raised during the public comment period.

4 And, finally, for "Transportation," we have the
5 removal of State Route 221 from consideration as an
6 oversize and overweight load route, as the applicant-
7 supplied transportation impact assessment indicated
8 that it was not intended to be used for such purpose.
9 Should that change in the future, we would require
10 additional data collection and potentially mitigation.

11 Next slide, please.

12 And, again, I won't read through all of these.
13 This is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all
14 the changes within Chapter 4. There are substantial
15 rewrites throughout. But a few that are more pressing
16 based on the degree of change or the relevancy to the
17 number of public comments received.

18 Under "Air," we included an air dispersion
19 modeling analysis that was added for several emissions,
20 which often includes the newly proposed use of an
21 on-site concrete batch plant during construction, as at
22 the applicant's request.

23 Under "Vegetation," we added a new mitigation
24 measure, Vegetation-9, that requires that the applicant
25 regularly clear project fencing of any vegetative

1 growth, with the goal of both reducing the visual
2 impact of the fencing and the risk of fire due to the
3 fuel load that the vegetation -- that the vegetation
4 could represent.

5 Under "Wildlife," Species-5 mitigation has been
6 expanded. This specifically targets impacts to
7 ferruginous hawk, the ferruginous hawk, and would
8 disallow construction of project components within two
9 miles of documented ferruginous hawk nests, except in
10 cases where the applicant is able to demonstrate that
11 the nest site and foraging habitat is no longer
12 available and that the compensatory habitat would
13 provide a net gain in ferruginous hawk habitat.

14 For this mitigation, habitat deemed no longer
15 available would include habitat that has been altered
16 by landscape-scale development to the extent that the
17 territory is no longer viable for that species.

18 And the pre-construction technical advisory group
19 and EFSEC are required to approve and concur with that
20 determination of nonviability and would be required --
21 that would be required for any encroachment on this
22 two-mile buffer. And additional mitigation would be
23 developed as necessary if there is an encroachment on
24 this historic nest that is no longer viable.

25 And for "Historic & Cultural," there is one case

1 of the reduction of a determination of significance.
2 For pre-contact archaeological isolates in the draft
3 EIS, they were determined to be -- the impact was
4 determined to be significant even after the imposition
5 of applicant commitments and EFSEC mitigation.

6 We have reduced that to a determination of
7 nonsignificance based on the fact that the cultural
8 resource avoidance plan would ensure that the two
9 identified pre-contact isolates found on-site would not
10 be impacted or affected by project actions.

11 And, finally, "Visual." We have the removal of
12 the Visual-4 mitigation that was proposed in the draft
13 EIS, which would have required color-treating solar
14 collectors and support structure. Based on our review,
15 we believe that that tech- -- that technology is not
16 practical at this moment.

17 And we have included revisions to the Visual-5
18 mitigation, which requires the installation of
19 color-treated opaque fencing within half a mile of KOPs
20 or residences and believe that to be sufficient to
21 address the visual concerns associated with the -- the
22 solar arrays.

23 Next slide, please.

24 So for the purpose of SEPA and this -- this EIS,
25 we define "significant" as having a reasonable

1 likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact on
2 environmental quality or having a severe adverse impact
3 on environmental quality, even if the chance is not
4 considered great.

5 And for the EIS, significance is determined after
6 the assumed application of all relevant applicant
7 commitments and EFSEC staff-recommended mitigation
8 being imposed as part of the site certification
9 agreement.

10 After all of -- after this analysis and the
11 imposition of those commitments and mitigation, we have
12 determined that there are three SEPA environmental
13 resources with identified significant impacts, those
14 being visual aesthetics, recreation, and historic and
15 cultural.

16 Next slide, please.

17 For visual, this significant impact is associated
18 with the operation phase, specifically for the
19 comprehensive project due to the -- due to the
20 component of the wind turbines. We have identified
21 several visual mitigation outlined there that we
22 believe will reduce this impact and especially in
23 concert with the -- the turbine reductions that are
24 proposed by the applicant since the draft EIS.

25 But as -- as can be seen in more detail within our

1 Chapter 4 review of this resource, we believe that post
2 mitigation and applicant commitments, the turbines
3 would still dominate views from many key observation
4 points, and the landscape will appear strongly altered.
5 So we have recommended a -- a finding of significant
6 unavoidable adverse impacts for this resource.

7 Next slide, please.

8 For recreation, we have identified significant
9 unavoidable adverse impacts for the operation phase of
10 the project on paragliding and hang-gliding safety.
11 The area around the project is used for these
12 activities even though it is not an officially
13 designated use by any state agency.

14 We have identified several different mitigation
15 measures that we will recommend as to be incorporated
16 within the SCA, as -- as outlined therein, primarily
17 focused on coordinating with recreation groups and
18 performing outreach on a safety management plan. But
19 we believe that the turbines and solar arrays would
20 still limit recreation availability for paragliding and
21 hang gliding throughout the project area and present a
22 safety risk for those activities.

23 Next slide, please.

24 And the third resource where we believe that there
25 are significant unavoidable adverse impacts is, for

1 historic and cultural, specifically for traditional
2 cultural properties during the construction, operation,
3 and decommissioning phases of the project.

4 We have recommended mitigation in the form of
5 ongoing engagement with affected tribes in an attempt
6 to identify mitigation measures that they believe would
7 be effective in reducing any -- the -- the anticipated
8 impacts, but we believe that they will -- there --
9 there is insufficient mitigation that we have been able
10 to identify to reduce these impacts to a level of
11 nonsignificance, and we believe that there will be
12 significant impacts to traditional cultural properties
13 due to ground disturbance, physical alteration, loss of
14 access, and visual interference.

15 And for this resource in particular, the Yakama
16 Nation has provided a map of project components that
17 show which components will be impacted by TCPs and
18 identifies the number of TCPs that will be impacted by
19 each turbine. This map will not be included within the
20 publicly available EIS due to confidentiality concerns
21 but will be provided to the Council for the review
22 packet.

23 Next slide, please.

24 And to reiterate what -- what Ami said at the
25 start, we anticipate that the EIS will be issued by the

1 end of October and be available to the Council at that
2 point. We will be giving a second presentation at the
3 November 29th Council meeting that will more
4 specifically address Council actions and the next steps
5 in the EFSEC process to follow Council review of the
6 EIS.

7 And Council members are encouraged to ask any
8 questions that they have either now or at the November
9 meeting, once they've had time to look at the EIS, and
10 EFSEC staff will be available to answer any questions
11 that they arrive at during their review of the EIS once
12 it is available to them outside of Council's scheduled
13 meetings.

14 One final note is that the -- the November 29th
15 meeting will include a -- several subject matter expert
16 guests from other agencies as -- to be available for
17 Council questions. And they have requested that, if
18 Council members identify questions that they have for
19 those subject matter experts prior to that November
20 29th meeting, they would appreciate EFSEC staff being
21 available -- or being able to transmit those questions
22 to them so they can more comprehensively answer --
23 answer those questions.

24 But at this point, I'm available to answer any
25 questions that you have based on this presentation.

1 CHAIR DREW: Thank you very much for
2 a very comprehensive presentation.

3 When you speak about the November 29th meeting,
4 that is a special meeting -- is that not right? -- and
5 not our usual November meeting, Ms. Hafkemeyer?

6 MS. HAFKEMEYER: That is correct.
7 Staff will be noticing a special meeting on November
8 29th specifically for the purposes of answering Council
9 questions on their review of the final EIS and having
10 the subject matter experts available.

11 As Sean mentioned, we -- we have identified some
12 subject matter experts that are already scheduled to be
13 there, but if Council identify questions in their
14 review and they have specific subject matter experts
15 that they would like to get some more information from
16 or ask questions of, that would be helpful for us to --
17 to include those people.

18 CHAIR DREW: And if I can just go
19 over one more time what our next steps are. Maybe
20 Ms. Bumpus can work with me on this so that we make it
21 clear for the public and for the Council members: That
22 we have deliberation on the adjudication, and that will
23 result in an order of findings and conclusions on the
24 information we gathered through the adjudicative
25 process.

1 In the SEPA process, we have the -- the conclusion
2 of the final environmental impact statement which goes
3 through you, Ms. Bumpus, as the SEPA responsible
4 official.

5 What we do with this information as a Council is
6 we take the information from this as well as the
7 adjudication to form our recommendation to the
8 governor. Is that true?

9 MS. BUMPUS: That's correct.

10 CHAIR DREW: Does the Council have
11 questions about that, or is that clear? Okay.

12 Are there questions from Council members at this
13 point in time? I know there's a lot to chew on, so...

14 I would also say that you can also reach out to
15 EFSEC staff -- Ms. Bumpus, Ms. Hafkemeyer, Mr. Greene
16 primarily -- on the FEIS if you have questions you'd
17 like to ask them to clarify.

18 MS. HAFKEMEYER: Ms. Moon is also
19 very knowledgeable about the project and is available
20 for questions, just not this week.

21 CHAIR DREW: Okay. She does deserve
22 a minute or two off.

23 Sure. Go ahead. Mr. Levitt.

24 MR. LEVITT: Yeah, I guess I just
25 want to ask one question based on the presentation. It

1 says, "Ongoing engagement with affected tribes to
2 identify appropriate mitigation measures that could
3 include the demarcation of culturally sensitive areas
4 to be avoided..."

5 That one's just interesting to me, 'cause it seems
6 like we've heard from people that tribes would prefer
7 the culturally sensitive areas not be easily
8 identified. So if you demarcate them, then other
9 people can know where they are.

10 MR. GREENE: Yeah, that -- that's
11 absolutely a good point. That is why no geographic --
12 geographical data that we have available for
13 traditional cultural properties is being shared within
14 the publicly available EIS. That mitigation measure is
15 intended to ensure that EFSEC, the applicant, and
16 affected tribes continue coordination throughout the
17 life of the project and prior to construction.

18 If the identification of no-go zones is something
19 that the tribes are interested in -- and which, as you
20 point out, would necessarily involve the -- the
21 disclosure of the location of those -- those cultural
22 resources -- that is something that we want to be
23 available for discussion. I don't know if it is
24 practicable, but we are retaining it there as an
25 option.

1 MR. LEVITT: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. YOUNG: Chair -- Chair Drew,
3 this is Lenny Young.

4 If I may, Sean, I've got three questions for you,
5 one that pertains to the post-adjudication changes to
6 the ASC and then two that per- -- pertain to the final
7 EIS.

8 As to the first: Were there any post-
9 adjudications to the ASC that expressly addressed
10 traditional cultural property concerns raised by the
11 Yakama Nation?

12 MR. GREENE: There was nothing
13 specifically that addressed those concerns. I would
14 note that the reductions that were proposed in the
15 project layout, one of the resources that was discussed
16 as potentially benefitting from those reductions was
17 cultural and historic resources. To this point, I -- I
18 don't believe that the applicant has been made aware of
19 the exact geographical location of TCPs of concern.

20 MR. YOUNG: Okay. And so was there
21 any specific correlation between any of the
22 post-adjudication changes and areas in which concern
23 about TCPs had been expressed?

24 MR. GREENE: I -- I can say that TCP
25 concerns cover the -- almost the entirety of the

1 project area. So I don't want to give out any
2 geographical information. But any reduction that was
3 proposed by the applicant would, to some degree or
4 another, benefit or reduce TCP impacts.

5 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thanks.

6 And then I'm going to defer to Shona Voelckers,
7 and then I'll -- I'll return with my next two
8 questions.

9 CHAIR DREW: We're taking questions
10 only from Council members.

11 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Then -- then I'll
12 proceed.

13 The next two questions I have are more related to
14 the FEIS.

15 In the cumulative impacts assessment, one of the
16 lines of testimony that the Council heard during the
17 adjudicative proceedings was around landscape-level
18 impacts to the way that air flows, velocities and air
19 flow patterns.

20 Was any of this taken into account in the final
21 EIS in the terms of cumulative impacts and how
22 development of one particular area could impact the
23 quality and the availability of air and wind in other
24 parts of the landscape?

25 MR. GREENE: I don't know that it

1 has at this point. I know that we are still developing
2 Chapter 5, which is a cumulative impacts chapter, so we
3 can look at incorporating that if it is not already in.

4 MR. YOUNG: Great. Thank you.

5 And then my -- my last question is: In terms of
6 the -- the new aspect of the analysis around impacts to
7 the wine industry, I wanted to see whether impacts to
8 the wine industry in terms of the growing and the
9 production and manufacturing of wine, were those
10 distinguished from impacts to the wine tourism
11 industry? Because it strikes me that perhaps impacts
12 might be slightly different between or somewhat
13 different between those two -- two specific areas, wine
14 production versus wine tourism.

15 MR. GREENE: Yeah, you're -- you are
16 correct. The agricultural lands that are targeted for
17 this project do not, to my knowledge, include any
18 active vineyards. The new analysis that was included
19 within the FEIS was really more focused on the
20 ecotourism industry and the -- and the socioeconomic
21 impacts associated with that.

22 MR. YOUNG: Great. I think that
23 might be significant in terms of whether -- whether we
24 consider it more in the realm of socioeconomic impacts
25 versus impacts to the practice of agriculture.

1 And thank you for your responses. I'm done.

2 CHAIR DREW: Are there additional
3 questions from Council members?

4 MR. LIVINGSTON: Yeah. Chair Drew,
5 this is Mike Livingston.

6 CHAIR DREW: Go ahead.

7 MR. LIVINGSTON: I have a question
8 for Sean Greene.

9 With the two-mile buffer that's being instituted
10 around ferruginous hawk nests, do you -- do you have a
11 number for me as to how many would be -- that would be
12 applied to?

13 CHAIR DREW: How many turbines? Is
14 that your question, Mr. Livingston? No.

15 MR. LIVINGSTON: No.

16 CHAIR DREW: How many --

17 MR. LIVINGSTON: The -- how many --
18 how many nest sites.

19 CHAIR DREW: Okay.

20 MR. LIVINGSTON: Or territories.

21 What -- I -- what is the metric first? I guess that's
22 clarification. Is it territories, or is it nest sites?
23 And then how many? Thank you.

24 MR. GREENE: Sure. So a lot of this
25 is outlined in our Chapter 3 and 4 discussion of

1 wildlife. But we have used historical docu- --
2 historically documented ferruginous hawk nests as the
3 baseline in addition to those nests that were
4 identified during the, at this point, I believe five
5 years of surveys performed by the applicant. We have
6 also included his- -- historic nesting habitat.

7 And any -- any -- any location where a nest has
8 been documented at any point is considered -- is what
9 we are considering a potentially active ferruginous
10 hawk nest. So every historically documented nest is
11 given that two-mile buffer, which then leads to that --
12 that discussion of, if we can come to a understanding
13 that the habitat in the area is no longer viable and
14 that nest is no longer present, then there could
15 potentially be project actions within that buffer with
16 additional mitigation. But any -- any place where we
17 have ever identified a nest is considered as part of
18 that mitigation.

19 MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you.

20 MR. GREENE: Oh. And I'm sorry. I
21 think you asked for a number. I -- I don't have the
22 exact number. I think it's around 60, but somewhere
23 around there.

24 CHAIR DREW: And we will have that
25 information at the end of the month and then the

1 opportunity to also go into more depth with agency
2 experts during the 29th meeting as well.

3 So thank you, Council members, for your very good
4 questions.

5 And at this point in time, we will be moving on
6 to -- and thank you, Sean, for your excellent
7 presentation.

8 And we will be moving on, then, to the Badger
9 Mountain project update. Ms. Snarski.

10 MS. SNARSKI: Yes. Thank you, Chair
11 Drew. And good afternoon, Council members. For the
12 record, this is Joanne Snarski, the siting specialist
13 for Badger Mountain Solar.

14 Progress continues to be made on the development
15 of the draft environmental impact statement for the
16 proposed Badger Mountain Solar project. At the
17 previous Council meeting, staff identified that we
18 would be conducting additional cultural resource survey
19 work, and we are working with our consultant, WSP, to
20 prepare for this activity.

21 EFSEC and WSP have finalized a contract for the
22 additional survey, and it appears they may be able to
23 complete the work before the snow is on the ground. We
24 anticipate the findings of the survey will be
25 incorporated into the draft environmental impact

1 statement.

2 That's it. And do you have any questions?

3 CHAIR DREW: No. But I'm happy to
4 hear that, and we'll keep our fingers crossed that we
5 can do that. Thank you, Ms. Snarski.

6 MS. SNARSKI: Yeah. Yeah.

7 CHAIR DREW: Okay. We are now
8 moving on to the Wautoma Solar project. Mr. Caputo.

9 MR. CAPUTO: Thank you, Chair Drew
10 and Council members. The applicants for the Wautoma
11 Solar energy project recently sub- -- I'm sorry? --
12 recently submitted the final supplemental cultural
13 resource survey requested by EFSEC and the Department
14 of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. We are
15 presently reviewing the report for compliance in
16 coordination with DAHP and the Yakama Nation cultural
17 staff. After we have concurrence from DAHP, we will
18 prepare a SEPA threshold determination.

19 May I answer any questions?

20 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions
21 about the project update?

22 MR. CAPUTO: And I do have one more
23 statement.

24 CHAIR DREW: From the -- for the
25 extension request.

1 MR. CAPUTO: Yes.

2 In your information packets, you'll find a request
3 by the applicants for an extension of their application
4 till June 28th, 2024. Staff have coordinated with the
5 applicant on the timeline. We did not receive any
6 public comments on the extension. Therefore, staff
7 recommends the Council approve the applicant's request.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

10 Are there any questions from Council members about
11 the extension request? You see that in front of you
12 and received it in the information for the meeting. An
13 extension request until -- now I'm not finding it --
14 June 28th, 2024. Thank you. Okay. First sentence
15 there.

16 So any questions for Mr. Caputo on that, or any
17 comments from Council members?

18 Okay. Is there a motion to approve the extension
19 request for the Wautoma Solar application to June 28th,
20 2024?

21 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. So moved.

22 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

23 Second?

24 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster.

25 Second.

1 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

2 Is there any discussion?

3 All those in favor, please say "aye."

4 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

5 CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

6 Motion is adopted. Thank you.

7 We are now moving on to the Hop Hill Solar Project
8 update. Mr. Barnes.

9 MR. BARNES: Thank you, Chair Drew
10 and Council members. For the record, this is John
11 Barnes, EFSEC staff, for the Hop Hill application
12 update for September.

13 We are continuing to coordinate and review the
14 application with our contract and contracted agencies
15 and tribal governments. We are anticipating receiving
16 supplemental information in the coming weeks.

17 **A land-use consistency legal advice memo has been**
18 **drafted by our assistant attorney general and has been**
19 **provided for you in the October Council packet. At**
20 **this time, we would like to request the Council to**
21 **direct the staff to prepare an order of inconsistency**
22 **with which the Council would then review and vote on at**
23 **the November meeting.**

24 **Are there any questions?**

25 CHAIR DREW: Are there any questions

1 for Mr. Barnes?

2 You-all did receive the legal advice memo. And
3 the motion would be to direct the staff to draft an
4 order determining the land use to be inconsistent and
5 setting the matter for adjudication.

6 Are there any questions either for Mr. Barnes or
7 for our AAG?

8 Okay. Hearing none.

9 Is there a motion to direct the staff to draft an
10 order determining land use to be inconsistent and
11 setting the matter for adjudication?

12 MS. BREWSTER: Stacey Brewster. So
13 moved.

14 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.

15 MR. YOUNG: Lenny Young. Second.

16 CHAIR DREW: Thanks.

17 Discussion?

18 All those in favor, say "aye."

19 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.

20 CHAIR DREW: Opposed?

21 Motion carries.

22 Carriger Solar update. Ms. Snarski.

23 MS. SNARSKI: Hello again. Thank
24 you, Chair Drew and Council members. For the record,
25 this is Joanne Snarski, the siting specialist for

1 Carriger Solar.

2 EFSEC staff continue to work with the Carriger
3 Solar applicant to address anticipated visual impacts
4 to the proposed project. In accordance with
5 RCW 80.50.090, Sub 3, Sub a, the applicant is allowed
6 to provide clarification to make changes to the
7 proposal to mitigate the anticipated environmental
8 impacts.

9 We are currently in the process of evaluating the
10 needs for supplemental visual simulations to help us
11 better understand the potential impacts. These new
12 simulations will lead to further potential mitigation
13 discussions and will result in a formal written
14 response to our initial SEPA determination of
15 significance by the applicant.

16 I can answer any questions.

17 CHAIR DREW: Yes. If you could, the
18 visual simulations, are they being conducted by the
19 applicant?

20 MS. SNARSKI: Correct. Well,
21 their -- their consultant. But, yes, we are working --

22 CHAIR DREW: Their consultant.

23 MS. SNARSKI: Correct. Yeah.

24 CHAIR DREW: And then we --

25 MS. SNARSKI: But we work --

1 CHAIR DREW: -- reviewed -- right.
2 And then reviewed by our staff. Okay.

3 MS. SNARSKI: Correct. Yes.

4 CHAIR DREW: And our consultants as
5 well.

6 MS. SNARSKI: Yes.

7 CHAIR DREW: And -- thank you. Just
8 to clarify that I heard that correctly.

9 Any other questions from Council members?

10 Okay. Thank you for your report.

11 We'll move on to the second-quarter cost
12 allocation. Ms. Bumpus.

13 MS. BUMPUS: Thank you. Good
14 afternoon, Chair Drew and Council members.

15 As we do at the beginning of each quarter, I have
16 the second-quarter cost allocations to report to the
17 Council. So I'll just go through and read off these
18 percentages.

19 For Kittitas Valley: We have 4 percent.

20 Wild Horse: 4 percent.

21 Columbia Generating Station: 20 percent.

22 Columbia Solar: 4 percent.

23 WNP-1: 2 percent.

24 Whistling Ridge: 3 percent.

25 Grays Harbor 1 and 2: 6 percent.

1 Chehalis: 6 percent.
2 Desert Claim: 4 percent.
3 Goose Prairie Solar: 4 percent.
4 Horse Heaven Wind Farm: 15 percent.
5 Badger Mountain: 6 percent.
6 Cypress Creek Renewables: 4 percent.
7 Wautoma: 6 percent.
8 Hop Hill: 6 percent.
9 And Carriger: Also 6 percent.
10 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
11 MS. BUMPUS: And that concludes the
12 update on the cost allocation.
13 CHAIR DREW: Thank you.
14 And with that, our agenda is concluded. Thank
15 you, all, for your participation.
16 The meeting is adjourned.
17 (Meeting adjourned at
18 2:37 p.m.)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR,
2) ss a certified court reporter
3 County of Pierce) in the State of Washington, do
4 hereby certify:

5 That the foregoing Monthly Meeting of the Washington
6 State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council was conducted
7 in my presence and adjourned on October 18, 2023, and
8 thereafter was transcribed under my direction; that the
9 transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the
10 said meeting, transcribed to the best of my ability;

11 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel
12 of any party to this matter or relative or employee of any
13 such attorney or counsel and that I am not financially
14 interested in the said matter or the outcome thereof;

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
16 this 3rd day of November, 2023.

17 _____
18 /s/ John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR
19 Certified Court Reporter No. 2976
20 (Certification expires 5/26/2024.)
21
22
23
24
25